

Appl. No. 10/656,673  
Atty. Docket No. 2003B089  
Amdmt. dated March 31, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of February 9, 2006

---

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

#### Status and Request for Reconsideration

Reconsideration of this application is requested. The claims submitted for reconsideration are claims 15, 20-22, and 105-114.

Claims 15, 20-22, and 110-113 have been amended to be in independent form, based upon the claim or claims from which each claim previously depended. The dependency of the remaining claims has been corrected accordingly. Thus, no new matter has been entered and no new issues are presented. Entry of the amendment is, therefore, appropriate.

#### Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C §§ 112

Claims 1-15 and 19-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C §§ 112, second paragraph, for being indefinite in not having sufficient antecedent basis for the term “the disengaging unit.” This amendment is believed to have corrected this clerical error. Accordingly, this rejection should be removed.

#### Claim Rejections and Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-14, 19, and 104-109 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,302,565 (Goeke) in view of the Fisher-Klosternan (Fisher) reference. However, it was further indicated that claims 15, 20-22, and 110-114 contained allowable subject matter.

Applicant has amended claims 15, 20-22, and 110-113 to be in independent form, thereby including the subject matter from the claim or claims from which they previously depended. Claim 114 remains dependent upon claim 113. Accordingly, all of the independent claims in this application have been amended such that they are now allowable. All remaining claims are dependent claims, and are also allowable.

#### Specification

The Abstract has been objected to for improper language, and correction was required. In making this objection, it has been emphasized in italics that the abstract “should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, ‘The disclosure concerns,’ ‘The disclosure defined by this invention,’ ‘The disclosure describes,’ etc.” Applicant notes that none of those phrases are used

Appl. No. 10/656,673  
Atty. Docket No. 2003B089  
Amdmt. dated March 31, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of February 9, 2006

---

in the Abstract per se, and it is not believed that the language of the Abstract is inappropriate. Accordingly, Applicant requests removal of the objection.

Election/Restriction

Claims 23-103 have been canceled in order to further the prosecution of this application. This cancellation of claims should not be implied to mean that Applicant agrees with the previous election/restriction requirement. By this cancellation of claims, Applicant reserves the right to further prosecute the subject matter of the canceled claims by way of a divisional application.

Appl. No. 10/656,673  
Atty. Docket No. 2003B089  
Amdmt. dated March 31, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of February 9, 2006

---

### **CONCLUSION**

Having amended each of the remaining claims in accordance with the indication of allowable subject matter, all rejections of claims have been overcome. This application is, therefore, in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests early and favorable reconsideration in the form of a Notice of Allowance.

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated, since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response. Please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1712 (Docket #: 2003B089).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 31, 2006



Frank Reid  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 37,918

ExxonMobil Chemical Company  
Law Technology  
P.O. Box 2149  
Baytown, Texas 77522-2149  
Telephone No. (281) 834-1743  
Facsimile No. (281) 834-2495